

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

APRIL SARAGOSA,

Plaintiff,

v.

XIAMEN 45 ZHI JU TECHNOLOGY CO.,
LTD., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01380-RFB-BNW

ORDER

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 21) of the Honorable Brenda N. Weksler, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on June 5, 2024. A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by June 19, 2024. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

///

///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** for failure to prosecute by the court-ordered deadline.

DATED: October 15, 2024

[Signature]

RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE